

OMITTED VALUES AND DYNAMICS OF MEROMORPHIC FUNCTIONS

TARAKANTA NAYAK AND JIAN-HUA ZHENG

ABSTRACT. Let M be the class of all transcendental meromorphic functions $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ with at least two poles or one pole that is not an omitted value, and $M_o = \{f \in M : f \text{ has at least one omitted value}\}$. Some dynamical issues of the functions in M_o are addressed in this article. A complete classification in terms of forward orbits of all the multiply connected Fatou components is made. As a corollary, it follows that the Julia set is not totally disconnected unless all the omitted values are contained in a single Fatou component. Non-existence of both Baker wandering domains and invariant Herman rings are proved. Eventual connectivity of each wandering domain is proved to exist. For functions with exactly one pole, we show that Herman rings of period two also do not exist. A necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a dense subset of singleton buried components in the Julia set is established for functions with two omitted values. The conjecture that a meromorphic function has at most two completely invariant Fatou components is confirmed for all $f \in M_o$ except in the case when f has a single omitted value, no critical value and is of infinite order. Some relevant examples are discussed.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a transcendental meromorphic function. The set of points $z \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ in a neighborhood of which the sequence of iterates $\{f^n(z)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is defined and forms a normal family is called the Fatou set of f and is denoted by $\mathcal{F}(f)$. The Julia set, denoted by $\mathcal{J}(f)$, is the complement of $\mathcal{F}(f)$ in $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$. It is well-known that the Fatou set is open and the Julia set is a perfect set. A component of $\mathcal{F}(f)$, to be called as a *Fatou component*, is mapped into a component of $\mathcal{F}(f)$. For a Fatou component U , U_k denotes the Fatou component containing $f^k(U)$ where we take $U_0 = U$ by convention. A Fatou component U is called p -periodic if p is the least natural number satisfying $U_p = U$. We say U is invariant if $p = 1$. An invariant component U is called completely invariant if $f^{-1}(U) = U$. If U is not periodic but U_n is periodic for some natural number n , then U is called pre-periodic. A Fatou component is called wandering if it is neither periodic nor pre-periodic. A periodic

Date: November 8, 2012.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 37F50, 37F10(primary).

Key words and phrases. Herman ring, omitted value, meromorphic function.

The first author is supported by China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (Grant no. 20090450420) and is now on leave from National Institute of Technology, Rourkela (India).

The second author is partially supported by National Natural Foundation of China (Grant No. 10871108).

Fatou component of a meromorphic function is one of the five types, namely an attracting domain, parabolic domain, Herman ring, Siegel disk or Baker domain. A Siegel disk or a Herman ring is not completely invariant by definition. A detailed description can be found in [4]. Each limit function of $\{f^n\}_{n>0}$ on U is a constant if U is an attracting or a parabolic domain whereas it is a nonconstant function if U is a Herman ring or a Siegel disk. On a Baker domain, each limit function of $\{f^n\}_{n>0}$ is either infinity or one of its pre-images. The sequence $\{f^n\}_{n>0}$ can have infinitely many subsequential limits (which are all constants in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$) on a wandering domain. The connectivity of a periodic Fatou component is known to be 1, 2 or ∞ . An invariant Fatou component is doubly connected if and only if it is a Herman ring. It is not known whether a doubly connected periodic Fatou component of period greater than 1 is always a Herman ring [7]. A pre-periodic Fatou component can have any finite connectivity [3].

Let M be the class of transcendental meromorphic functions $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ such that f has either at least two poles or exactly one pole that is not an omitted value. These functions are usually referred to in the literature as *general meromorphic functions*. The backward orbit of ∞ is an infinite dense subset of the Julia set in this case. Let O_f denote the set of all omitted values of f . Then O_f has at most two elements and for each $w \in O_f$, there is no ordinary point lying over w and each singularity of f^{-1} lying over w is necessarily transcendental (in fact direct). The definition and classification of singularities of inverse function of a transcendental meromorphic function can be found in [6].

Let

$$M_o = \{f \in M : O_f \neq \emptyset\} \text{ and } M_o^k = \{f \in M : O_f \text{ has } k \text{ elements}\} \text{ for } k \in \{1, 2\}.$$

For $f \in M_o^2$, let $O_f = \{a, b\}$. Then for a mobius map T with $T(a) = 1$ and $T(b) = -1$, $T(f) \in M_o^2$ and $O_{T(f)} = \{1, -1\}$. Now, $\frac{T(f)+1}{T(f)-1}$ is a transcendental entire function omitting 0 and can be written as e^{2g} for some entire function g . Thus, $T(f) = \frac{1}{\tanh(g)}$ and $f(z) = S(\tanh(g(z)))$ for the mobius map $S(z) = T^{-1}(\frac{1}{z})$. Note that $S(1) = T^{-1}(1) = a \neq \infty$ and $S(-1) = T^{-1}(-1) = b \neq \infty$ which gives that $S^{-1}(\infty) \neq \pm 1$. A point z is a pole of f iff $\tanh(g(z)) = S^{-1}(\infty)$. Since f is a meromorphic function with two distinct finite omitted values, Picard's theorem implies that f has infinitely many poles whenever $f \in M_o^2$. Similarly, a function in M_o^1 can be written as $\frac{1}{h(z)} + a$ where a is the omitted value of f and $h(z) = \frac{1}{f(z)-a}$ is an entire function. In this case, f can have finitely many poles.

Singular values are well-known to be related in an important way to the dynamics of a meromorphic function. For a transcendental meromorphic function, omitted values are a special kind of singular value. The significance of these values to some dynamical issues is investigated in this article. It is shown that the local dynamics of a transcendental meromorphic function at its omitted values determine the topology of its Fatou set and hence of its Julia set in considerable detail. This in turn leads to several useful conclusions. A multiply connected Fatou component of a transcendental entire function is known to be a Baker wandering domain [2]. A transcendental meromorphic function with exactly one pole that is an omitted

value has at most one multiply connected Fatou component and this must be doubly connected [1]. Multiply connected wandering domains for functions in $M_F = \{f \in M : f \text{ has at most finitely many poles}\}$ were discussed in Zheng [16] and Rippon et al. [15]. However, multiply connected Fatou components of general meromorphic functions are not restricted in general and this is a characteristic departure from all the earlier cases.

Our earlier discussion shows that $M_o \cap M_F \neq \emptyset$ and $M_o \setminus M_F \neq \emptyset$. This article examines multiply connected Fatou components for functions in the class M_o and establishes a complete classification in terms of the behavior of their forward orbits. It is shown that such a Fatou component is either wandering or lands only on some special types of components, namely a Herman ring, infinitely connected Baker domain or a Fatou component containing all the omitted values of the function. As a corollary, it follows that the Julia set of f is not totally disconnected unless all the omitted values are contained in a single Fatou component. Some additional results on the dynamics of functions in M_o are also presented, the proofs of which partly depend on the key ideas of the proofs of the earlier results. Invariant Herman rings and Baker wandering domains are shown to be non-existent for all functions in M_o . Eventual connectivity of each wandering domain is determined. For functions with exactly one pole, we show that Herman rings of period two also do not exist. A necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a dense subset of singleton buried components in the Julia set is proved for $f \in M_o^2$. The conjecture that a meromorphic function has at most two completely invariant Fatou components is confirmed for all $f \in M_o$ except the case when f has a single omitted value, no critical value and is of infinite order. Statements of all results with brief motivation and implications are given in Section 2. Section 3 contains the proofs of Theorems (1)-(5). The rest of the results are proved in Section 4. Some examples are discussed at relevant places.

For a closed curve γ in $\mathbb{C}$, let $B(\gamma)$ denote the union of all the bounded components of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \gamma$. For a domain D in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$, we denote its boundary and connectivity by ∂D and $c(D)$ respectively. By a component of the Julia set we mean a maximally connected subset of the Julia set. We denote the component of the Julia set containing a point $z \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ (or a set A) by $\mathcal{J}_z$ (or $\mathcal{J}_A$). For a set A , let $|A|$ denote the number of elements in A , A^c its complement in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\overline{A}$ its closure in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$. A Fatou component U is said to land on a Fatou component V if $U_n = V$ for some n . Unless specifically mentioned, by saying ‘for all n ’, we mean ‘for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ ’ throughout this article.

2. RESULTS

A classification of all multiply connected Fatou components of $f \in M_o$ is made in the sense that each such component is wandering or lands on a Fatou component U where U contains all the omitted values of f , or U is either a Herman ring or an infinitely connected Baker domain of period greater than 1. Precise situations leading to these possibilities are the content of Theorems (2.1)-(2.8).

We say a Fatou component V is SCH if one of the following holds.

- (1) V is simply connected.
- (2) V is multiply connected with $c(V_n) > 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $V_{\bar{n}}$ is a Herman ring for some $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$.

Clearly, U is SCH implies U_1 is SCH whenever $c(U) > 1$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $f \in M_o$ and $\mathcal{J}(f) \cap O_f \neq \emptyset$. If $f \in M_o^2$ or $f \in M_o^1$ with $|\mathcal{J}_{O_f}| > 1$, then each Fatou component of f is SCH.*

The next two results deal with the situation when O_f intersects the Fatou set. If the set O_f intersects two Fatou components U_1 and U_2 , then exactly one of the following conditions holds:

- (a) Both U_1 and U_2 are unbounded,
- (b) Exactly one of U_1 and U_2 is unbounded, call it U_1 and U_1 is simply connected,
- (c) Exactly one of U_1 and U_2 is unbounded, call it U_1 and U_1 is multiply connected with U_2 contained in the unbounded component of U_1^c ,
- (d) Exactly one of U_1 and U_2 is unbounded, call it U_1 and U_1 is multiply connected with U_2 contained in a bounded component of U_1^c ,
- (e) Both U_1 and U_2 are bounded.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose $f \in M_o$. Let the set O_f intersect two distinct Fatou components U_1 and U_2 of f . Then,*

- (1) *If either (a) or (b) is satisfied, then all the Fatou components of f are simply connected.*
- (2) *The possibility (c) cannot be true.*
- (3) *If either (d) or (e) is satisfied, then each Fatou component of f is SCH.*

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose $f \in M_o$. Let O_f be contained in a Fatou component U and V be a Fatou component with $V_n \neq U$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. Recall that ‘for all n ’ means ‘for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ ’.*

- (1) *If U is unbounded, then $c(V_n) = 1$ for all n .*
- (2) *If U is bounded, then V is SCH.*
- (3) *If U is wandering, then $c(U_n) = 1$ for all n .*
- (4) *Let U be pre-periodic but not periodic. If U is unbounded, then $c(U_n) = 1$ for all n . If U is bounded, then U is SCH.*
- (5) *If U is periodic, then $c(U_n) = 1$ or ∞ for all n .*

Example 2.4. Both the possibilities of Theorem 2.3 (v) can be true. To see it, consider $\lambda \frac{z^m}{\sinh^m z}$ where m or $\frac{m}{2}$ is an odd natural number and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. It is shown in [12] that the only omitted value 0 is in $\mathcal{F}(f_\lambda)$ for all λ . Further, a critical parameter $\lambda^* > 0$ is found such that $\mathcal{F}(f_\lambda)$ is connected and $c(\mathcal{F}(f_\lambda)) = \infty$ for all $|\lambda| < \lambda^*$ and for $|\lambda| > \lambda^*$, each component of $\mathcal{F}(f_\lambda)$ is simply connected. Denoting the Fatou component containing 0 by U we have for $|\lambda| < \lambda^*$, $U = \mathcal{F}(f_\lambda)$ and $c(U_n) = c(\mathcal{F}(f_\lambda)) = \infty$ for all n . For $|\lambda| > \lambda^*$, U is a 2-periodic component and $c(U_n) = 1$ for all n .

Remark 2.5. The Fatou component V as assumed in the Theorem 2.3 may not always exist. This is illustrated in the above example where each Fatou component

eventually lands on a periodic Fatou component (1-periodic for $|\lambda| < \lambda^*$ and 2-periodic otherwise) that contains all the omitted values of the function.

The residual Julia set of f , denoted by $\mathcal{J}_r(f)$, is defined as the set of all those points in $\mathcal{J}(f)$ that do not belong to the boundary of any Fatou component. As observed by Baker and Domínguez [9], this set is also residual in the sense of category theory. A component of $\mathcal{J}(f)$ that is contained in $\mathcal{J}_r(f)$ is called a buried component. For $|O_f| = 1$, $O_f \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$ and $|\mathcal{J}_{O_f}| = 1$, the Fatou set has at least one multiply connected component. The next two theorems deal with all the multiply connected Fatou components in this situation. We say a point z is a pre-pole if $f^n(z) = \infty$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Recall that for two Fatou components U and V , U is said to land on V if $U_n = V$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $f \in M_o^1$, $O_f = \{a\} \subset \mathcal{J}(f)$ and $|\mathcal{J}_a| = 1$. If $\mathcal{J}_a$ is not a buried component of the Julia set, then f has an infinitely connected Baker domain B with period $p > 1$ and a is a pre-pole. Further, for each multiply connected Fatou component U of f not landing on any Herman ring, there is a non-negative integer n depending on U such that $U_n = B$. In this case, singleton buried components are dense in $\mathcal{J}(f)$.*

Corollary 2.7. *Let $f \in M_o^1$, $O_f = \{a\} \subset \mathcal{J}(f)$ and $|\mathcal{J}_a| = 1$. Then,*

- (1) $\mathcal{J}_a$ is not buried if and only if a is a pre-pole.
- (2) f has no completely invariant Fatou component.

Proof. (1) If $\mathcal{J}_a$ is not buried then a is a pre-pole by Theorem 2.6. Conversely, let a be a pre-pole. Then $\mathcal{J}_\infty$ is a buried component of the Julia set whenever $\mathcal{J}_a$ is. Suppose $\mathcal{J}_a$ is a buried component. By taking a continuum c in $\mathcal{J}(f)$ with sufficiently small diameter such that it separates $\mathcal{J}_a$ from ∞ we can see that $f^{-1}(c)$ has an unbounded component which must be in the Julia set. However, it is not possible as $\mathcal{J}_\infty$ is a buried component. Thus $\mathcal{J}_a$ is not buried.

- (2) If f has a completely invariant Fatou component U , then $\mathcal{J}_a \subset \mathcal{J}(f) = \partial U$, which means that $\mathcal{J}_a$ is not buried and $c(U) > 1$. By Theorem 2.6, U must land on a Herman ring or on a Baker domain of period greater than 1 which contradicts the complete invariance of U . To see this, note that a Herman ring is not completely invariant by definition. Hence, the claim follows. $\square$

Theorem 2.8. *Let $f \in M_o^1$, $O_f = \{a\} \subset \mathcal{J}(f)$ and $|\mathcal{J}_a| = 1$. If $\mathcal{J}_a$ is a buried component of the Julia set, then all the multiply connected Fatou components not landing on any Herman ring are wandering and a is a limit point of $\{f^n\}_{n>0}$ on each of these wandering domains. Further, if $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has a multiply connected wandering domain, then the forward orbit of a is an infinite set and singleton buried components are dense in $\mathcal{J}(f)$.*

For functions with two omitted values, if at least one omitted value is in the Julia set then each multiply connected Fatou component (if it exists) ultimately lands on

a Herman ring. The same is also true when a function has only one omitted value and the component of the Julia set containing this value is nonempty and not a singleton (see Theorem 1). On the other hand, if there is only one omitted value of a function and the component of the Julia set containing this value is a singleton, then each multiply connected Fatou component is either wandering or eventually becomes a Herman ring or an infinitely connected Baker domain of period greater than 1. A multiply connected Fatou component (if it exists) ultimately lands on a Herman ring or on a Fatou component containing all the omitted values whenever all the omitted values are in the Fatou set. As evident from the aforementioned theorems, there are situations in which multiply connected Fatou components do not really occur.

The conclusion of the next result is known for all transcendental meromorphic functions with finitely many poles [8].

Corollary 2.9. *Let $f \in M_o$. If O_f is not contained in a single Fatou component of f , then $\mathcal{J}(f)$ is not totally disconnected.*

Proof. If all the Fatou components are simply connected, then $\mathcal{J}(f)$ is connected and the claim follows trivially. Suppose $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has at least one multiply connected component U . Then U is either a wandering domain or lands on V where V is a Herman ring or a Baker domain of period greater than 1 by Theorems (2.1), (2.2), (2.6) and (2.8). Therefore, U cannot be completely invariant and $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has at least one component different from U . The boundary of U has a non-singleton component and thus, $\mathcal{J}(f)$ is not totally disconnected. $\square$

For a function $f \in M_o$ not satisfying the assumption of the above corollary, everything is possible regarding the connectivity of the Julia set as described by the following examples.

Example 2.10. Let M_o^* be the class of all meromorphic functions f in M_o with O_f contained in a single Fatou component of f . Then,

- (1) There exists a function $f_1 \in M_o^*$ such that $\mathcal{J}(f_1)$ is disconnected but not totally disconnected. This can be seen by taking $f_1(z) = \lambda(e^z + 1 + \frac{1}{e^z+1})$, $0 < \lambda < \lambda^*$ where λ^* is as defined in [11]. This function has a single omitted value 2λ and it is proved in [11] that the Fatou set is an infinitely connected attracting domain containing 2λ and the Julia set is not totally disconnected.
- (2) There exists a function $f_2 \in M_o^*$ such that $\mathcal{J}(f_2)$ is totally disconnected. This can be seen by taking $f_2(z) = \lambda \tan z$, $-1 < \lambda < 1$. In this case, $\mathcal{F}(f_2)$ is connected and contains $O_{f_2} = \{i\lambda, -i\lambda\}$ but $\mathcal{J}(f_\lambda)$ is a totally disconnected set [10].
- (3) There exists a function $f_3 \in M_o^*$ such that $\mathcal{J}(f_3)$ is connected. By taking $f_3(z) = \lambda \frac{z^m}{\sinh^m}$, m or $\frac{m}{2}$ is an odd natural number and λ is any non-zero real number, it is observed that $O_{f_3} = \{0\}$. A critical parameter $\lambda^* > 0$ is found in [12] such that for $|\lambda| > \lambda^*$, $\mathcal{F}(f_3)$ is the basin of attraction or parabolic basin corresponding to a 2-periodic point and $0 \in \mathcal{F}(f_3)$. Further, it is

proved that all the Fatou components are simply connected which means that $\mathcal{J}(f_3)$ is connected.

The following result on singleton components of the Julia set is proved by Domínguez in [8].

Theorem 2.1 (A). *Let f be a transcendental meromorphic function satisfying one of the following.*

- (1) $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has a component with connectivity at least 3.
- (2) $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has three doubly connected components U_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$ such that either (a) each component lies in the unbounded component of the complement of the other two or (b) two of the components U_1, U_2 lie in the bounded component of U_3^c but U_1 lies in the unbounded component of U_2^c and U_2 lies in the unbounded component of U_1^c .

Then, singleton components are dense in $\mathcal{J}(f)$.

Ng et al. [13] proved a generalization as follows.

Theorem 2.2 (B). *Let f be a meromorphic function that is not of the form $\alpha + (z - \alpha)^{-k}e^{g(z)}$, where k is a natural number, α is a complex number and g is an entire function. Then $\mathcal{J}(f)$ has buried components if f has no completely invariant Fatou components and its Julia set is disconnected. Moreover, if $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has an infinitely connected component, then the singleton buried components are dense in $\mathcal{J}(f)$.*

Using the above two results, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for existence of singleton buried components in $\mathcal{J}(f)$ for $f \in M_o^2$.

Theorem 2.11. *Let $f \in M_o^2$. Then, the singleton buried components are dense in $\mathcal{J}(f)$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has no completely invariant component and $\mathcal{J}(f)$ is disconnected.*

- Remark 2.12.*
- (1) The above result is similar to the so-called Makienko's conjecture, which states that the residual Julia set of a rational function of degree at least two is empty if and only if the Fatou set of f has a completely invariant component or consists of only two components.
 - (2) The proof of Theorem 2.11 shows that the Julia set contains singleton components whenever it is disconnected. This is the conclusion of Theorem A for all meromorphic functions when the Julia set is disconnected in some specific ways not covering all possibilities.
 - (3) Suppose $f \in M_o^2$ and $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has a Herman ring. Existence of a completely invariant Fatou component U would imply that each Fatou component other than U is simply connected. A Herman ring is not completely invariant by definition and hence is different from U . Thus, the Herman ring must be simply connected which is a contradiction and we conclude that $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has no completely invariant component. Since $\mathcal{J}(f)$ is disconnected, by Theorem 2.11, singleton buried components are dense in $\mathcal{J}(f)$ whenever $f \in M_o^2$ and $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has a Herman ring.

Corollary 2.13. *Let $f \in M_o^2$. If $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has a completely invariant component V and $\mathcal{J}(f)$ is disconnected, then V is the only multiply connected Fatou component and $C(V) = \infty$. Further, $O_f \subset V$.*

Proof. A disconnected Julia set implies the existence of at least one multiply connected Fatou component. The first part of the corollary is a consequence of the fact that if $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has a completely invariant component then each of its other components, if such exist, is simply connected. Now, $c(V) = \infty$ follows from the fact that V is not a Herman ring. If O_f intersects the Julia set, then V is SCH by Theorem 2.1. Theorem 2.2 gives that V is SCH whenever the set O_f intersects two Fatou components. Note that a multiply connected completely invariant Fatou component, in particular V , cannot be SCH. Thus, O_f is contained in a single Fatou component, say U . If $U \neq V$ then $V_n = V \neq U$ for all n . By Theorem 2.3(i) and (ii), either $c(V_n) = 1$ for all n or V is SCH. As just observed, none of this can be true. Therefore, $U = V$ and $O_f \subset U$ as desired. $\square$

Example 2.14. The assumption of Corollary 2.13 is not always true. In other words, there are functions g in M_o^2 for which $\mathcal{F}(g)$ has a completely invariant simply connected component and consequently, has a connected Julia set. An example is $g(z) = \lambda + \tan z$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, which has two omitted values $\lambda + i$ and $\lambda - i$ and hence is in M_o^2 . For each λ with $\Im(\lambda) > 0$, it is seen that the upper half plane is contained in a completely invariant attracting domain, say U [11]. By choosing $\lambda = i + \frac{\pi}{2}$ (any other pole of $\lambda + \tan z$ can be taken in place of $\frac{\pi}{2}$), we observe that $\frac{\pi}{2}$ is a pole as well as an omitted value of g , i.e., $O_g \cap \mathcal{J}(g) \neq \emptyset$. Applying Theorem 2.1, we have $c(U) = 1$ and consequently, the Julia set is connected.

Conjecturally, the number of completely invariant Fatou components of a meromorphic function is at most two. This has been proved to be true for rational functions, transcendental entire functions and transcendental meromorphic functions of finite type (those with finitely many singular values). In what follows, we confirm this for most of the functions in M_o . Note that the functions in the class M_o are not necessarily of finite type.

Theorem 2.15. *Let $M_{cv} = \{f \in M : f \text{ has at least one critical value}\}$ and $CIFC_f$ denote the set of all completely invariant Fatou components of f .*

- (1) *If $f \in M_o^2$, then $|CIFC_f| \leq 2$.*
- (2) *If $f \in M_o^2 \cap M_{cv}$, then $|CIFC_f| \leq 1$.*
- (3) *If $f \in M_o^1 \cap M_{cv}$, then $|CIFC_f| \leq 2$.*

Remark 2.16. If $f \in M_o^1 \setminus M_{cv}$ is of finite order, then a result of Bergweiler et al. [6] guarantees that it has at most finitely many asymptotic values. Consequently, f is of finite type and the number of completely invariant Fatou components is at most two. The other case when f is of infinite order remains open.

Example 2.17. (1) In Theorem 2.15(i), $|CIFC_f|$ can be 0, 1 or 2. As shown in [10], for all $\lambda > 1$, $\mathcal{F}(\lambda \tan z)$ is the union of two completely invariant components, namely the upper and the lower half planes. The other

two possibilities hold for the function $\lambda \tanh(e^z)$ for suitable values of λ . This function has two omitted values λ and $-\lambda$ and hence is in M_o^2 . A critical parameter $\lambda^* > 0$ is found in [14] such that $\mathcal{F}(\lambda \tanh(e^z))$ is the basin of attraction or parabolic basin corresponding to a 2-periodic point for $\lambda < \lambda^*$. In this case, each periodic component has at least a pre-image different from itself and therefore, $\mathcal{F}(\lambda \tanh(e^z))$ has no completely invariant component. For $\lambda > \lambda^*$, it is proved that $\mathcal{F}(\lambda \tanh(e^z))$ is a completely invariant attracting domain.

- (2) There exists a meromorphic function without any omitted value but with critical values such that it has two completely invariant Fatou components. For example, the upper and lower half planes are completely invariant Fatou components for $z + \tan z$. In this case, there are no omitted values and all the critical values are in the Fatou set. Thus Theorem 2.15 (ii) is not true in general for functions without omitted values.

It has been proved that multiply connected Fatou components are Herman rings or their pre-images in most cases. We prove mild restrictions on the possibility of these domains.

Theorem 2.18. *Let $f \in M_o$. If H is a p -periodic Herman ring of f , then the bounded component of H^c contains an essential singularity of f^p . In particular, $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has no invariant Herman ring. Further, if f has only one pole then Herman rings of period 2 do not exist.*

A wandering domain U is called Baker wandering if for large enough n , U_n is bounded, multiply connected and surrounds 0 such that $U_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Given any path $\gamma(t) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(t) = \infty$, γ intersects U_n for all large n where U is any Baker wandering domain of f . Consequently, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(\gamma(t))$ cannot be finite. This rules out the possibility of a finite asymptotic value and in particular, any omitted value for f . Thus, we have proved

Theorem 2.19. *If $f \in M$ has a finite asymptotic value, then $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has no Baker wandering domain. In particular, this is the case for all $f \in M_o$.*

Theorem 2.8 gives a possibility for existence of multiply connected wandering domains for $f \in M_o$. Eventual connectivity of a wandering domain W of a meromorphic function is said to exist if $c(W_n) = p$ for all sufficiently large n and some $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Existence of eventual connectivity in general is a question yet to have a complete answer. Zheng obtained the following result.

Theorem 2.3 (C). *[([18, p. 219])] Let $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ be transcendental meromorphic and W be a wandering domain in $\mathcal{F}(f)$. Then, exactly one of the following is true.*

- (1) For each n , $c(W_n) = \infty$.
- (2) For all large n , $c(W_n) = 1$ or 2.
- (3) For all large n , $c(W_n) = p \geq 3$ and p is independent of n . In this case, $f : W_n \rightarrow W_{n+1}$ is univalent for all large n .

As an application, it was proved in [18] that for an entire function, the eventual connectivity of its wandering domains is 2 or ∞ if it is a Baker wandering domain and 1 otherwise. This is proved by Rippon et al. [15] for meromorphic functions with finitely many poles. Here we prove the following.

Theorem 2.20. *Let W be a wandering domain of $f \in M_o$. Then eventual connectivity of W ($ec(W)$) exists. More precisely,*

- (1) *If $f \in M_o^1$, $O_f = \{a\} \subset \mathcal{J}(f)$ and $\mathcal{J}_a$ is singleton and buried, then $ec(W) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.*
- (2) *In all other cases, $ec(W) = 1$.*

Remark 2.21. For a meromorphic function with finitely many poles, a multiply connected wandering domain W is Baker wandering if and only if W_n is multiply connected for infinitely many values of n [15]. From this and Theorem 2.19, we conclude that if a function $f \in M_o$ has finitely many poles and has a wandering domain W , then $c(W_n) = 1$ for all but finitely many values of n . In other words, eventual connectivity of each wandering domain is one.

3. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6 AND 2.8

The following lemma concerning general meromorphic functions is useful for our purposes.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $f \in M$ and V be a multiply connected Fatou component of f . Also suppose that γ is a closed curve in V with $B(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$. Then there is an $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and a closed curve $\gamma_n \subseteq f^n(\gamma)$ in V_n such that $B(\gamma_n)$ contains a pole of f . Further, if $O_f \neq \emptyset$, then $O_f \subset B(\gamma_{n+1})$ for some closed curve γ_{n+1} contained in $f(\gamma_n)$.*

Proof. Since $f \in M$ and $B(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$, there exists a $z \in B(\gamma)$ satisfying $f^k(z) = \infty$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The set $\mathcal{N} = \{m \in \mathbb{N} : f^m(z) = \infty \text{ for some } z \in B(\gamma)\}$ is a non-empty subset of $\mathbb{N}$ and the Well-Ordering Property of natural numbers gives that $\mathcal{N}$ has a smallest element. Let it be $\tilde{n}$ and set $n = \tilde{n} - 1$. Then $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $f^n : B(\gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is analytic. Hence, $\gamma_n = \partial(f^n(B(\gamma)))$ is a closed curve contained in V_n with $\gamma_n \subseteq f^n(\gamma)$ and $B(\gamma_n)$ contains a pole of f .

Suppose that the closure of $f(B(\gamma_n))$ contains an element a of O_f . Let $\{w_k\}_{k>0}$ be a sequence in $f(B(\gamma_n))$ converging to a and for each k , let z_k be a point in $B(\gamma_n)$ satisfying $f(z_k) = w_k$. Then, considering a limit point z_0 of $\{z_k\}_{k>0}$ we observe that $z_0 \in \overline{B(\gamma_n)}$. The continuity of f at z_0 gives that $f(z_0) = a$. This is a contradiction since a is an omitted value. Therefore, $O_f \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{f(B(\gamma_n))}$. The set $\overline{f(B(\gamma_n))}$ is connected and contains a neighborhood of ∞ . Consequently, $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{f(B(\gamma_n))}$ is a non-empty open set whose boundary is contained in $f(\gamma_n)$ and there is a closed (and bounded but not necessarily simple) curve $\gamma_{n+1} \subseteq f(\gamma_n)$ such that $O_f \subset B(\gamma_{n+1})$. □

Remark 3.2. (1) Lemma 3.1 also implies that, if there is a multiply connected Fatou component of f for $f \in M$, then there exists a pole such that the

component of $\mathcal{J}(f)$ containing it is bounded. In other words, if each component of the Julia set $\mathcal{J}(f)$ containing a pole of f is unbounded, then all the Fatou components of f are simply connected.

- (2) It follows from the proof of Lemma 3.1 that $c(V_j) > 1$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ where n is as given in Lemma 3.1.
- (3) The second part of the proof of the above lemma gives that $O_f \cap \overline{f(B)} = \emptyset$ for every bounded domain B .

Now, we present a lemma that will be used repeatedly.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $f \in M_o$ and V be a multiply connected Fatou component of f . Suppose there are two distinct numbers $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that for every closed curve α in $\bigcup_{k \geq 0} V_k$ satisfying $O_f \subset B(\alpha)$, we have $B(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$ and $c_1, c_2 \in B(\alpha)$. Then $c(V_n) > 1$ for all n and $V_{\tilde{n}}$ is a Herman ring for some $\tilde{n} \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.*

Proof. Let γ be a closed curve in V such that $B(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 3.1, there is an $\tilde{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ and a closed curve $\gamma_{\tilde{n}}$ in $V_{\tilde{n}}$ with $\gamma_{\tilde{n}} \subseteq f^{\tilde{n}}(\gamma)$ such that $O_f \subset B(\gamma_{\tilde{n}})$. By assumption of this lemma, we have $B(\gamma_{\tilde{n}}) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$. Setting $n_1 = \tilde{n}$, we have a multiply connected Fatou component V_{n_1} of f and a closed curve γ_{n_1} in V_{n_1} with $\gamma_{n_1} \subseteq f^{n_1}(\gamma)$ such that $B(\gamma_{n_1}) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$. Applying Lemma 3.1 again to γ_{n_1} and V_{n_1} , we can find $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $O_f \subset B(\gamma_{n_1+m+1})$ where γ_{n_1+m+1} is a closed curve with $\gamma_{n_1+m+1} \subseteq f^{m+1}(\gamma_{n_1}) \subset V_{n_1+m+1}$. Set $n_2 = n_1 + m + 1$ and observe that $n_2 > n_1$. This argument can be repeated since V_{n_2} is a multiply connected Fatou component (which follows from assumption) containing a closed curve γ_{n_2} such that $B(\gamma_{n_2}) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$. An inductive argument gives rise to an increasing sequence $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ such that $O_f \subset B(\gamma_{n_k})$ for each k . It is clear from Remark 3.2 (ii) that $c(V_n) > 1$ for $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{n_1, n_2, n_3, \dots\}$. Since the above considerations give $c(V_n) > 1$ for $n \in \{n_1, n_2, n_3, \dots\}$, we conclude that $c(V_n) > 1$ for all n .

Since the sequence $\{f^n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is normal on V , $\{f^{n_k}\}_{k \geq 0}$ has a subsequence converging uniformly to a function $g(z)$ on compact subsets of V . Without loss of generality, we denote this subsequence by $\{f^{n_k}\}_{k \geq 0}$. Now, if $g(z)$ is a constant function $c \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ then two cases arise as follows.

Case I: $c \in \mathbb{C}$

Since $\{c_1, c_2\} \subset B(\gamma_{n_k})$ for each k , we can choose a finite point c' in $\{c_1, c_2\} \setminus \{c\}$ that is contained in $B(\gamma_{n_k})$ for all k . Now, each ball around c with radius less than $|c - c'|$ will contain γ_{n_k} for all sufficiently large k . This gives that $c' \notin B(\gamma_{n_k})$ for sufficiently large k leading to a contradiction.

Case II: $c = \infty$

Now we have that $f^{n_k}|_V \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly on compact subsets of V , and $\gamma_{n_k} \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Since $O_f \subset B(\gamma_{n_k})$, we can assume that, there is a pole in each $B(\gamma_{n_k})$. Then, by Lemma 3.1, $O_f \subset B(\gamma_{n_k+1})$ where $\gamma_{n_k+1} \subseteq f(\gamma_{n_k})$ is a Jordan curve as given in the lemma. If γ_{n_k+1} has a finite limit then, after passing down to a subsequence if necessary, a contradiction can be obtained as in Case I. Therefore, $\gamma_{n_k+1} \rightarrow \infty$ and $f^{n_k+1}(\gamma) \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. There exists a tract U over a small neighborhood of $a \in O_f$. Obviously, $\gamma_{n_k} \cap U \neq \emptyset$ for each k and

$f(\gamma_{n_k} \cap U)$ is contained in a small neighborhood of a and at the same time, we have $f(\gamma_{n_k} \cap U) \subset f^{n_k+1}(\gamma)$. This is a contradiction.

Thus, $f^{n_k}|_V$ converges uniformly to a non-constant function. In particular, V is not a wandering domain and $V_{\bar{n}}$ is periodic for some $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Since $c(V_n) > 1$ for all n , $V_{\bar{n}}$ cannot be a Siegel disk and it must be a Herman ring as desired. $\square$

Remark 3.4. (1) Let the second sentence of the assumption of the Lemma 3.3 be modified as “Suppose there is a complex number c such that for every closed curve α in $\bigcup_{k \geq 0} V_k$ satisfying $O_f \subset B(\alpha)$, we have $B(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$ and $c \in B(\alpha)$ ”. Then, we still get $c(V_n) > 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. However, it is not true in general that V ultimately lands on a Herman ring in this case.
 (2) Following the arguments of Lemma 3.1, it is seen that if $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has a multiply connected component V then a closed curve α exists in $\bigcup_{k \geq 0} V_k$ such that $O_f \subset B(\alpha)$.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let V be any multiply connected Fatou component. Also, let α be a closed curve in $\bigcup_{k \geq 0} V_k$ such that $O_f \subset B(\alpha)$. Such a closed curve exist in view of Remark 3.4(ii). Then $B(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$ by assumption. If $f \in M_o^2$ then choose c_1, c_2 to be the omitted values of f . If $|O_f| = 1$ and $|\mathcal{J}_{O_f}| > 1$, then choose any two distinct points of $\mathcal{J}_{O_f}$ as c_1 and c_2 . Now, $c_1, c_2 \in B(\alpha)$ and are independent of α . Therefore, V is SCH by Lemma 3.3. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.2. (1) Suppose V is a multiply connected Fatou component of f and α is a closed curve in V such that $B(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 3.1, there is an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a closed curve $\alpha_n \subseteq f^n(\alpha) \subset V_n$ such that $O_f \subset B(\alpha_n)$. Since $U_i \cap O_f \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 2$, we have $U_i \cap B(\alpha_n) \neq \emptyset$ for each i . Further, if U_i is unbounded for some i , then $U_i \cap \alpha_n \neq \emptyset$ and consequently, $U_i = V_n$. Let (a) hold. Then each U_i is unbounded and we have $V_n = U_i$ for each i which means that $U_1 = U_2$. This contradicts our assumption that $U_1 \neq U_2$. Now, let (b) be true. Then U_1 is unbounded and simply connected. We have $U_1 = V_n$. Since $O_f \subset B(\alpha_n)$ and $U_1 \neq U_2$, it follows that $U_2 \subset B(\alpha_n)$. Therefore, U_1^c has a bounded component containing U_2 . In particular, $c(U_1) > 1$. But $c(U_1) = 1$ is assumed in (b). Therefore, all the Fatou components of f are simply connected whenever either (a) or (b) is satisfied.

- (2) Let (c) be true. Then U_1 is a multiply connected unbounded component with U_2 contained in the unbounded component of U_1^c . Considering U_1 in place of V and arguing similarly as in the first portion of the preceding case, we can get $U_{1+n} = U_1$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and U_2 contained in a bounded component of U_1^c . However, this contradicts the assumption made in (c). Thus, the possibility (c) cannot be true.
 (3) Suppose V is a multiply connected Fatou component of f and α is a closed curve in $\bigcup_{k \geq 0} V_k$ such that $O_f \subset B(\alpha)$. Such a closed curve α exists in view of Remark 3.4(ii). Then $U_i \cap B(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 2$. Let (d) be satisfied. Unboundedness of U_1 gives $U_1 \cap B(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$ and $\partial U_2 \subset B(\alpha)$.

Similarly, if (e) is satisfied then at least one element of $\{\partial U_1, \partial U_2\}$, say ∂U_1 , is contained in $B(\alpha)$. Choose two distinct points c_1, c_2 in $B(\alpha) \cap \partial U_2$ if (d) is true or in $B(\alpha) \cap \partial U_1$ if (e) is true. Then $c_1, c_2 \in B(\alpha)$ and $B(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$ for each closed curve α in $\bigcup_{k \geq 0} V_k$ with $O_f \subset B(\alpha)$. By Lemma 3.3, V is SCH. $\square$

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose $f \in M_o$. If $O_f \cap U \neq \emptyset$ for some Fatou component U , then $c(U_1) = 1$ implies $c(U) = 1$.*

Proof. Assume $U_1 \neq U$ because the proof is trivial for $U = U_1$. Suppose U is multiply connected and α is a closed curve in U with $B(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$. If $B(\alpha)$ contains a pole of f , then there exists a closed curve $\alpha_1 \subseteq f(\alpha) \subset U_1$ such that $O_f \subset B(\alpha_1)$. It gives that $\partial U \subset B(\alpha_1)$ and consequently, $B(\alpha_1) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$. If $B(\alpha)$ does not contain a pole of f , then f is an analytic function on $B(\alpha)$ and we have $B(\alpha_1) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, $c(U_1) > 1$. In other words, $c(U_1) = 1$ implies $c(U) = 1$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.3. (1) If V_k is multiply connected for some $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, then by Lemma 3.1, there is a closed curve $\alpha \subset V_m$ for some $m \geq k$ such that $O_f \subset B(\alpha)$. Since $V_n \neq U$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $O_f \subset U$, we have $\partial U \subset B(\alpha)$. However, this is not possible if U is unbounded. Therefore, U is unbounded implies $c(V_n) = 1$ for all n .

(2) If α is a closed curve in $\bigcup_{k \geq 0} V_k$ such that $O_f \subset B(\alpha)$ then $\partial U \subset B(\alpha)$ since $V_n \neq U$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. This means that $B(\alpha)$ intersects the Julia set and contains two points c_1, c_2 of ∂U for any closed curve α in $\bigcup_{k \geq 0} V_k$ with $O_f \subset B(\alpha)$. By Lemma 3.3, V is SCH.

(3) Setting $V = U_1$, we observe that $V_n = U_{1+n} \neq U$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. If U is unbounded, then $c(U_n) = 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by Theorem 2.3 (i). If U is bounded, then $V = U_1$ is SCH by Theorem 2.3(ii). In fact, the proof of Theorem 2.3(ii) gives that $V_n = U_{1+n}$ is SCH whenever U is bounded. Consequently, if $c(V_n) > 1$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ then V_{n^*} is a Herman ring for some natural number n^* . This is not possible since V is already assumed to be a wandering domain. Therefore, $c(V_n) = 1$ for all n and as result, we get $c(U_n) = 1$ for all natural numbers n . Now, simple connectedness of $U_0 = U$ follows from Lemma 3.5 and the proof is complete.

(4) Observe that $U_k \neq U$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ since U is pre-periodic but not periodic. If U is unbounded, then $c(U_k) = 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ by Theorem 2.3 (i). Lemma 3.5 gives $c(U) = c(U_0) = 1$. If U is bounded, then $c(U) > 1$ implies $c(U_1) > 1$ by Lemma 3.5. By Theorem 2.3 (ii), U_1 is SCH which means U is SCH.

(5) The component U cannot be a Herman ring as it contains at least one omitted value. Therefore, $c(U_n) = 1$ or ∞ for all n . $\square$

Now, we present a lemma before giving the proof of Theorem 2.6. The proof of the lemma follows trivially. Recall that $\mathcal{J}_z$ denotes the component of $\mathcal{J}(f)$ containing z .

Lemma 3.6. *Let $f \in M_o^1$ and $O_f = \{a\} \subset \mathcal{J}(f)$. Suppose U is a Fatou component of f and ∂U contains a point $s \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ such that $\mathcal{J}_s$ is singleton. Then $\mathcal{J}_{f(s)}$ is a singleton component of ∂U_1 where we take $f(\infty) = a$. In particular, $c(U_n) = \infty$ for all n .*

Proof of Theorem 2.6. That the component $\mathcal{J}_a$ of the Julia set is a singleton and not buried means $\mathcal{J}_a \subset \partial U$ for some Fatou component U and $c(U) = \infty$. Taking a closed curve γ in U with $B(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$ and arguing similarly as in the first part of the proof of Lemma 3.3, a sequence of closed curves $\{\gamma_{n_k}\}_{k>0}$ can be found such that $\mathcal{J}_a \subset B(\gamma_{n_k})$ for a closed curve $\gamma_{n_k} \subseteq f^{n_k}(\gamma) \subset U_{n_k}$. Note that $c(U_{n_k}) > 1$ for each k . Further, if $f^{n_k}|_U$ has a constant limit function, then it can only be ∞ or a . In view of the arguments of Case-II of the proof of Lemma 3.3, we can assume, without loss of generality, that $f^{n_k}|_U \rightarrow a$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $c(U_{n_k}) > 1$ for each k .

Suppose U is a wandering domain. Then, $U_{n_k} \neq U_{n_{k'}}$ for $k \neq k'$ and it follows that $\mathcal{J}_a$ is a buried component of the Julia set: a contradiction. Therefore, U_p is a periodic Fatou component for some p .

Suppose $\{U_p, U_{p+1}, U_{p+2}, \dots, U_{p+(l-1)}\}$ is the l -periodic cycle of Fatou components. Then, there is a subsequence $\{n_{k(i)}\}_{i>0}$ of $\{n_k\}$ and some $t \in \{p, p+1, p+2, \dots, p+(l-1)\}$ such that $f^{n_{k(i)}}(U_t) \subseteq U_t$. Further, if U_p is an attracting domain or a parabolic domain, then $f^{n_{k(i)}}|_{U_t} \rightarrow a$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Since $a \in \mathcal{J}(f)$, U_t , and hence U_p , is not an attracting domain. Also, U_p cannot be a parabolic domain because $a \subset B(\gamma_{n_{k(i)}})$ for each i . We have already observed that $c(U_{n_k}) > 1$. Consequently, U_p cannot be a Siegel disk. By Lemma 3.6, $c(U_p) = \infty$ and hence U_p is not a Herman ring. The only remaining case, which must be true, is that U_p is a Baker domain. That the period of U_p is at least two and a is a pre-pole follow from the fact that a is a finite complex number and is a limit function of $f^n|_{U_p}$.

For any multiply connected Fatou component V not landing on a Herman ring, the above argument clearly shows that $V_n = B$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

Setting $B = U_p$, we observe that $c(B) = \infty$. Further, $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has no completely invariant component since B is not itself completely invariant and any other completely invariant component would imply $c(B) = 1$. Now by Theorem B, singleton buried components are dense in the Julia set.

□

Now, we proceed to prove Theorem 2.8.

Proof of Theorem 2.8. Let W be any multiply connected Fatou component not landing on a Herman ring. Following the argument of the proof of Lemma 3.3, we observe that $\mathcal{J}_a \subset B(W_{m_k})$ and $f^{m_k}|_W \rightarrow a$ for some subsequence $\{m_k\}_{k>0}$. Now, $\mathcal{J}_a$ is buried gives that W does not land on a periodic Fatou component and hence, is wandering.

Suppose that $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has a multiply connected wandering domain. If the forward orbit of a is finite then we can find a subsequence $\{m_{k(i)}\}_{i>0}$ of $\{m_k\}_{k>0}$ such that $f^{m_{k(i)}}|_W \rightarrow a$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Applying Proposition 1 of [17] to this situation we conclude that a is a pre-pole. But this is not possible by Corollary 2.7 (i). Thus, the forward orbit of a is an infinite set. Evidently, each point of the grand orbit of a (this is the set of all points z satisfying $f^m(z) = f^n(a)$ for some $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$) is a singleton buried component of the Julia set which is clearly dense in $\mathcal{J}(f)$. $\square$

4. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 2.11, 2.15, 2.18 AND 2.20

The following result is due to Bolsch [7] and is stated in a simpler form to suit our purpose.

Theorem 4.1 (D). *Let $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ be a transcendental meromorphic function. If $H \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a domain and G is any component of $f^{-1}(H)$, then exactly one of the following holds.*

- (1) *There exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that f assumes in G every value of H exactly n times. In this case, $c(G) - 2 = n(c(H) - 2) + v$ and $v \leq 2n - 2$, v denoting the number of critical points of f in G counting multiplicities.*
- (2) *f assumes in G every value of H infinitely often with at most two exceptions. In this case, $c(H) > 2$ implies $c(G) = \infty$.*

In the above theorem, we say G is an island of multiplicity n over H if (i) holds ($f : G \rightarrow H$ is a proper map in this case). If (ii) holds, then G is said to be a tongue over H .

Proof of Theorem 2.11. If singleton buried components are dense in $\mathcal{J}(f)$, then it clearly follows that $\mathcal{J}(f)$ is disconnected and $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has no completely invariant components.

Conversely, suppose $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has no completely invariant components and $\mathcal{J}(f)$ is disconnected. If all the Fatou components of f are simply connected then $\mathcal{J}(f)$ is connected, which is against our assumption. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has at least one multiply connected component, say U . In view of Lemma 3.1, we can find an n such that U_n contains a closed and bounded curve γ with $O_f \subset B(\gamma)$. Let $B = B(\gamma)$ and B_{-1} be a component of $f^{-1}(B)$. Since f does not take two values of B in B_{-1} , the map $f : B_{-1} \rightarrow B$ cannot be proper. By Theorem D, B_{-1} is a tongue over B . Then B_{-1} is a component of $f^{-1}(B \setminus O_f)$ and is a tongue over $B \setminus O_f$. Observing that $c(B \setminus O_f) = 3$, we have $c(B_{-1}) = \infty$ by Theorem D(ii). Clearly, B_{-1} is unbounded as each singularity lying over an omitted value is transcendental.

Let all the bounded components of the boundary of B_{-1} be enumerated by γ_i for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. For each i , $f(\gamma_i) \subseteq \gamma$ gives that f has no pole on γ_i . Next, we assert that each γ_i is a continuum (compact and connected set) separating the plane and $B(\gamma_i) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$. If γ_i does not separate the plane for some i , then a Jordan curve α can be found in B_{-1} such that $\gamma_i \subset B(\alpha)$ and $f : B(\alpha) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is analytic. By the Maximum Modulus Principle, $f(B(\alpha))$ contains $f(\gamma_i)$. Since $f(\gamma_i) \subseteq \gamma$, γ is connected and $\partial(f(B(\alpha))) \subseteq f(\alpha)$ does not intersect γ , we have $\gamma \subset f(B(\alpha))$.

However, this is not possible because $f(\alpha)$ is a closed curve in B , B is simply connected and $\gamma = \partial B$. Therefore, each γ_i is a continuum separating the plane. If $f(\gamma_i)$ is properly contained in γ for some i then $f(B(\gamma_i)) \supseteq (\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus O_f) \setminus f(\gamma_i)$ where $B(\gamma_i)$ is the union of all bounded components of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \gamma_i$. If $f(\gamma_i) = \gamma$ then $f(B(\gamma_i)) = \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus B$ as $B(\gamma_i) \cap B_{-1} = \emptyset$. In any case, $f(B(\gamma_i))$ contains ∞ and hence f has a pole in $B(\gamma_i)$, which proves our assertion that $B(\gamma_i) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$. Note that $B(\gamma_i) \subset B(\gamma_j)$ is not possible for any $i \neq j$ as each γ_i is a bounded component of ∂B_{-1} and B_{-1} is an infinitely connected unbounded domain. Observe that each γ_i is a continuum in the Fatou set and γ_i^c has at least two components intersecting the Julia set. This implies that either $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has an infinitely connected component or has infinitely many components, each of which is at least doubly connected. This satisfies the assumption of Theorem A(ii) and we have that singleton components are dense in the Julia set. If any of these components is not buried then an infinitely connected Fatou component is found and it follows by Theorem B that singleton buried components are dense in the Julia set. This completes the proof. $\square$

The lemma to follow relates completely invariant Fatou components with the omitted values of a meromorphic function and will be used for proving Theorem 2.15. Recall that $M_o^k = \{f \in M : |O_f| = k\}$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and let $CIFC_f = \{V : V \text{ is a completely invariant Fatou component of } f\}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $M_{cv} = \{f \in M : f \text{ has at least one critical value}\}$.*

- (1) *Let $f \in M_o^2$ and $U \in CIFC_f$. Then $c(U) = 1$ if and only if $|U \cap O_f| = 1$.*
- (2) *Let $f \in M_o \cap M_{cv}$ and let $U \in CIFC_f$ be such that $c(U) = 1$. Then $CV_f \subset U$ or $O_f \subset U$ where CV_f denotes the set of all critical values of f . In particular, if $f \in M_o^2 \cap M_{cv}$, $U \in CIFC_f$ and $c(U) = 1$, then $CV_f \subset U$.*

Proof. (1) Let $f \in M_o^2$ and $U \in CIFC_f$. Suppose that $c(U) = 1$. First, we shall prove $|O_f \cap U| > 0$. If this is not true, then $O_f = \{a, b\} \subset U^c$. Take a point $u \in U$ (which is neither a critical value nor an omitted value of f) in a neighborhood of which f^{-1} has a well-defined analytic branch. Let this branch be ϕ . By the Gross Star Theorem [5, Proposition 1], ϕ can be continued analytically along a Jordan curve γ_1 passing through u and winding around a exactly once but not winding around b . The curve γ defined by $\phi(\gamma_1)$ has its end points u_1 and u_2 in U , which can be joined by a simple curve β entirely contained in U . This is possible since U is completely invariant and path connected. Setting $A = B(\gamma \cup \beta)$, the bounded component of $(\gamma \cup \beta)^c$, we observe that $\partial f(A) \subseteq \gamma_1 \cup f(\beta)$. Further, $f(\beta) \subset U$ and $c(U) = 1$ give that $f(\beta)$ winds around neither a nor b . This means $\gamma_1 \cup f(\beta)$ winds around a but not around b . Now, if f is analytic in A then $A \setminus U$ is mapped into $B(\gamma_1) \setminus U$ and, consequently, a is in the closure of $f(A)$. This is not possible by Remark 3.2 (iii). Supposing f has a pole in A , we observe that b is in the closure of $f(A)$ which is also not possible because of Remark 3.2 (iii). Thus, we conclude that $|O_f \cap U| > 0$. Note that U is a tongue over $U \setminus O_f$. If $|O_f \cap U| = 2$ then $c(U \setminus O_f) = 3$

and we have $c(U) = \infty$ by Theorem D(ii). This contradicts our initial assumption that $c(U) = 1$. Thus, $|O_f \cap U| = 1$.

Conversely, let $|O_f \cap U| = 1$. If $c(U) > 1$ then $O_f \subset U$ by Corollary 2.13, which means that $|O_f \cap U| = 2$ and our assumption is contradicted. Therefore, we conclude that $c(U) = 1$.

- (2) Let $f \in M_o \cap M_{cv}$ and let $U \in CIFC_f$ be such that $c(U) = 1$. Suppose that $CV_f \subset U$ is not true. Then a critical value c can be found in U^c . As in (i), take $u \in U$ such that it is neither a critical value nor an omitted value, an analytic branch ϕ of f^{-1} defined in a neighborhood of u , a Jordan curve γ_1 passing through u and winding around c once but not around any omitted value such that ϕ can be continued analytically along γ_1 . If f is analytic in $A = B(\gamma \cup \beta)$, then $\gamma_1 \cup f(\beta)$ winds around the critical value c at least twice. Since $c(U) = 1$ and $f(\beta) \subset U$, γ_1 winds around c at least twice. This is not true. Suppose f has a pole in A . If $O_f \subset U$ does not hold, then by repeating the arguments of the proof of (i) of this Lemma, a contradiction can be obtained. Thus, we conclude that $O_f \subset U$. If $f \in M_o^2 \cap M_{cv}$, $U \in CIFC_f$ and $c(U) = 1$, then $|U \cap O_f| = 1$ by Lemma 4.1(i). As $f \in M_o^2$, $O_f \subset U$ is not possible. Therefore, $CV_f \subset U$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.15. (1) Suppose $f \in M_o^2$ and $|CIFC_f| > 2$. Then each of the completely invariant components is simply connected. Further, each of them contains exactly one omitted value by Lemma 4.1(i). This is not possible since $|O_f| = 2 < |CIFC_f|$ and we conclude that $|CIFC_f| \leq 2$.

- (2) Suppose $f \in M_o^2 \cap M_{cv}$ and $|CIFC_f| > 1$. Then each of the completely invariant components is simply connected. Further, each of them contains either CV_f or O_f by Lemma 4.1 (ii). By Lemma 4.1(i), O_f cannot be contained in a single completely invariant Fatou component, which implies that each of these components must contain CV_f . This is not possible because $|CIFC_f| > 1$. Thus, $|CIFC_f| \leq 1$.
- (3) Suppose $f \in M_o^1 \cap M_{cv}$ and $|CIFC_f| > 2$. Then each of the completely invariant components is simply connected. Lemma 4.1(ii) gives that each of these components either contain CV_f or O_f . This cannot be true if $|CIFC_f| > 2$ and we conclude that $|CIFC_f| \leq 2$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.18. Suppose H is a p -periodic Herman ring and γ is an f^p -invariant curve in H . Let $B(H)$ denote the bounded component of H^c . An essential singularity of f^p cannot be in H and $B(H) = B(\gamma) \setminus H$. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove that $B(\gamma)$ contains an essential singularity of f^p . If f^p is analytic on $B(\gamma)$ then $f^p(B(\gamma)) = B(\gamma)$ and $f^p(B(\gamma_j)) = B(\gamma_j) \subset H_j$ for $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, p-1$ where $\gamma_j = f^j(\gamma)$. This implies that $\bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} f^k(B(\gamma))$ is bounded, which is not possible since $B(\gamma)$ intersects the Julia set. Therefore, f^p has at least a singularity in $B(\gamma)$. Now suppose that all these singularities are poles. Then $f^p(B(\gamma))$ is an

unbounded domain with its boundary contained in $f^p(\gamma) = \gamma$. Since there are f^p -invariant curves in $H \cap B(\gamma)$, $f^p(B(\gamma))$ intersects $B(\gamma)$ and $\partial f^p(B(\gamma))$ is properly contained in $f^p(\gamma) = \gamma$. Consequently, the closure of $f^p(B(\gamma)) = f(f^{p-1}(B(\gamma)))$ contains an omitted value of f . This is not possible by Remark 3.2 (iii) because $f^{p-1}(B(\gamma))$ is bounded. Thus, f^p has an essential singularity in $B(H)$.

For $p = 1$, ∞ is the only singularity of f^p and for each invariant Herman ring H , $\infty \in B(H)$. This is evidently not possible and we conclude that $\mathcal{F}(f)$ has no invariant Herman ring.

Suppose f has a single pole w_0 and it has a cycle of Herman rings $\{H_0, H_1\}$ of period 2. Since w_0 is the only finite essential singularity of f^2 , we have $w_0 \in B(H_i)$ for $i = 0, 1$. That means the Herman rings are nested. Let $B(H_1) \subset B(H_0)$. Take an f^2 -invariant Jordan curve γ in H_0 and set $\gamma_1 = f(\gamma)$. The set A defined by $B(\gamma) \setminus B(\gamma_1)$ does not contain the pole w_0 and $\partial A = \gamma \cup \gamma_1$ is preserved under f . Thus, $f(A) = A$ and $f^n(A) = A$ for all n . This negates the fact that $A \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, Herman rings of period two do not exist for $f \in M_o$ if f has only one pole. □

A proof of Theorem C using Theorem D is given for the sake of completeness.

Proof of Theorem C. Suppose that (i) is not true. Then $c(W_m)$ is finite for some m . If there is a k with $1 \leq c(W_k) \leq 2$, then noting that W_k is either an island or a tongue over W_{k+1} , it follows from Theorem D that $1 \leq c(W_{k+1}) \leq 2$. Consequently, $1 \leq c(W_n) \leq 2$ for all $n \geq k$ and conclusion (ii) holds. On the other hand, if $1 \leq c(W_k) \leq 2$ does not hold for any k then in view of Theorem D, we get that $f : W_n \rightarrow W_{n+1}$ is proper for all $n \geq m$ and by Theorem D(i), $c(W_n) \geq c(W_{n+1}) \geq c(W_{n+2}) \dots \geq 3$. Therefore, $c(W_n) = p \geq 3$ for all large n and p is independent of n . Now, it is easy to see from Theorem D (i) that $f : W_n \rightarrow W_{n+1}$ is univalent for all large n . □

Proof of Theorem 2.20. (1) If $c(W_n) = 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $ec(W) = 1$. Suppose $c(W_n) > 1$ for some n . Then, $c(W_n) > 1$ for all large n by Remark 3.4(i). It follows from Theorem C that $ec(W)$ exists and is ∞ , 2 or $p > 2$.

(2) It is clear from Theorems 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6 and 2.8 that in each situation different from that assumed in (i) above, each multiply connected Fatou component is either pre-periodic or a wandering domain V such that $c(V_n) = 1$ for all n . Therefore, $ec(W) = 1$. □

REFERENCES

- [1] Bibliography I. N. Baker, 'Wandering domains for maps of a punctured plane', *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn.* 12 (1987) 191–198.
- [2] Bibliography I. N. Baker, 'Domains of normality of an entire function', *Fenn. Ser. A I Math.* 1 (1975) 277–283.
- [3] Bibliography I. N. Baker, J. Kotus and L. Yinian, 'Iterates of meromorphic functions III: Preperiodic domains', *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* 11 (1991) 603–618.

- [4] Bibliography W. Bergweiler, 'Iteration of meromorphic functions', *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 29 (2) (1993) 151–188.
- [5] Bibliography W. Bergweiler and A. E. Eremenko, 'Direct singularities and completely invariant domains of entire functions', *To appear in Illinois J. Math.* .
- [6] Bibliography W. Bergweiler and A. E. Eremenko, 'On the singularities of the inverse to a meromorphic function of finite order', *Revista Math. Iberoamericana* 11 (1995) 355–373.
- [7] Bibliography A. Bolsch, 'Periodic Fatou components of meromorphic functions', *Bull. London Math. Soc.* 31 (1999) 543–555.
- [8] Bibliography P. Domínguez, 'Dynamics of transcendental meromorphic functions', *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* 23 (1998) 225–250.
- [9] Bibliography P. Domínguez and N. Fagella, 'Residual Julia sets of rational and transcendental functions', *Transcendental dynamics and complex analysis*, (Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- [10] Bibliography L. Keen and J. Kotus, 'Dynamics of the family $\lambda \tanh z$ ', *Conform. Geom. Dyn.* 1 (1997) 28–57.
- [11] Bibliography T. Nayak, 'Dynamics of certain transcendental entire and meromorphic functions', *Thesis available at <http://www.math.sunysb.edu/cgi-bin/thesis.pl?thesis07-1>*
- [12] Bibliography T. Nayak and M. G. P. Prasad, 'Iteration of certain meromorphic functions with unbounded singular values', *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* 30 (2010) 877–891.
- [13] Bibliography T. W. Ng, J. H. Zheng and Y. Y. Choi, 'Residual Julia sets of meromorphic functions', *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 141 (1) (2006) 113–126.
- [14] Bibliography M. G. P. Prasad and T. Nayak, 'Dynamics of $\{\lambda \tanh(e^z) : \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}\}$ ', *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-Series A* 19 (1) (September 2007) 121–138.
- [15] Bibliography P. J. Rippon and G. M. Stallard, 'On multiply connected wandering domains of meromorphic functions', *J. London Math. Soc.* 77 (2008) 405–423.
- [16] Bibliography J. H. Zheng, 'On multiply-connected Fatou components in iteration of meromorphic functions', *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 313 (2006) 24–37.
- [17] Bibliography J. H. Zheng, 'Singularities and limit functions in iteration of meromorphic functions', *J. London Math. Soc.* 67 (2) (2003) 195–207.
- [18] Bibliography J. H. Zheng, 'Dynamics of meromorphic functions (in Chinese)', *Tsinghua University Press* (2006).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES,, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING-100084,, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

E-mail address: jzheng@math.tsinghua.edu.cn

E-mail address: tnayak@iitbbs.ac.in